

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 are pending in the case. The Office Action objected to claim 9 and to the drawings. The Office Action also rejected each of claims 1-35 as follows:

- claims 1-2, 11-12, 16-23, and 25-26 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Letters Patent 6,618,045 (“Lin”); and
- claims 3-10, 13-15, 24, and 27-29 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lin in view of U.S. Letters Patent 6,674,436 (“Drešević”).

Applicants traverse each of the rejections.

### **I. COMMENTS ON THE AMENDMENTS**

Claim 9 was objected to as unclear, and has been amended above to cure the objection. Note that the amendment is not made for purposes of patentability and does not narrow the scope of the claim.

The Office Action objected to the drawings for using the reference numeral “305” for two different drawing elements. Applicants have cured the rejection by amending the reference numeral “305” in Figure 3B has been amended to “307”. The specification has been amended in ¶[0034] of the application as published (*i.e.*, p. 15, line 13 – p. 16, line 4 of the application as filed) to conform the written description to the amended Figure 3B. No new matter has been added.

### **II. CLAIMS 1-2, 11-12, 16-23, AND 25-26 ARE NOVEL**

The Office rejected claims 1-2, 11-12, 16-23, and 25-26 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Letters Patent 6,618,045 (“Lin”). An anticipating reference, by definition, must

disclose every limitation of the rejected claim in the same relationship to one another as set forth in the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Applicants respectfully submit that Lin fails to meet this standard as to the amended claims.

Each of the independent claims 1, 11, 19-20, and 25 has been amended to recite a user authentication prior to retrieval of a user profile associated with the authenticated user identification. Each of the dependent claims 2, 12, 16-18, 21-23, and 26 incorporates this limitation by virtue of their dependence. 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶4. Support for the amendments is found in, *inter alia*, FIG. 4 (at 425) and ¶[0038] of the application as published.

Applicants review of Lin failed to reveal any teaching, expressed or inherent, in Lin regarding user authentication. Each of claims 1-2, 11-12, 16-23, and 25-26, as is established above, includes a user authentication. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Lin fails to anticipate any of claims 1-2, 11-12, 16-23, and 25-26. M.P.E.P. § 2131; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

### **III. CLAIMS 3-10, 13-15, 24, AND 27-29 ARE UNOBVIOUS**

The Office rejected claims 3-10, 13-15, 24, and 27-29 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Letters Patent 6,618,045 (“Lin”) in view of U.S. Letters Patent 6,674,436 (“Dresevic”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j); *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Applicants respectfully submit that Lin fails to meet this standard as to the amended claims.

Again, as was established above, each of the independent claims 1, 11, 19-20, and 25 has been amended to recite a user authentication prior to retrieval of a user profile associated with

the authenticated user identification. Each of the dependent claims 3-10, 13-15, 24, and 27-29 incorporates this limitation by virtue of their dependence. 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶4.

Applicants review of the art of record shows that neither Lin nor Dresevic teaches, expressly or inherently, any degree of user authentication. Each of claims 3-10, 13-15, 24, and 27-29, as is established above, includes a user authentication. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the art of record fails to render obvious any of claims 3-10, 13-15, 24, and 27-29. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j); *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974).

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant therefore submits that the claims are definite and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 12, 2007

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON  
10333 Richmond Dr., Suite 1100  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(713) 934-4053 ph

/Jeffrey A. Pyle/

Jeffrey A. Pyle  
Reg. No. 34,904  
Attorney for Applicants